والمستحدث والمستعدد والمتعادية والمتعاد والمتعادية والم

RETURN TO CIA
Background Use Only
Do Not Reproduce

06 - 77 - 6276 1371 - 77

11 January 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, SE Division

ATTENTION : 1

Division Security Officer

FROM

(Thomas L. Briggs)

SE/X/LA

SUBJECT

: Appearance As Witness In Behalf of the

United States Government

REFERENCE

: USA V. Gerald P. Hemming, Et Al. (76-371-CR-CA)

- 1. During the period of my employment as a Special Agent at the Drug Enforcement Administration (My 1971) Jan 1977), I conducted an interview of Gerald Patrick Hemming (DPOB 1 March 1937, at Los Angeles, California) on 23 May 1975 at DEA Headquarters in Washington, D.C. My report concerning that interview has become part of the case file in USA v. Gerald P. Hemming, Et Al., Case Number 76-371-CR-CA, Southern District of Florida, Miami, Florida.
- 2. Upon my entrance on duty in SE Division on 5 January 1977, I orally informed the Division Security Officer, Billy Hix, about the information in paragraph 1 above. Mr. Hix asked me to submit the information in writing as soon as I was settled in the Division. On 7 January 1977, however, Special Agent Robert Fredericks telephonically contacted DC/SE/X/LA, and told her that the United States Attornery, Southern District of Florida, had requested that I appear at the U.S. Courthouse, Miami, Florida on 10 January 1977 to confer with the Assistant United States Attorney, Karen L. Atkinson, regarding my appearance as a witness in behalf of the U.S. Government in the trial of Gerald P. Hemming.
- 3. During the afternoon of 7 January 1977 I conferred with Mr. Hix who advised me to contact the Office of the General Counsel. I talked to Mr. Edmund Cohen who advised me to get in touch with the Office of Security, External Activities Branch (OS/EAB). I completed an Outside Activity Approval Request (Form 879), obtained the concurrence of DC/SE, Mr. John Stein, and submitted the Form 879 to OS/EAB. OS/EAB sent me to Central Cover Staff (Mr. Blandford) and then to the Office of the General Counsel. After discussions with Mr. Cohen, I called

S/A Fredericks in Miami at Mr. Cohen's suggestion. S/A Fredericks was not available. Mr. Cohen then advised me to return to my office and he would contact me with further instructions. Mr. Cohen retained the Form 879. Subsequently, Mr. Cohen advised me that I should travel to Miami as requested and that CIA would reimburse me for expenses connected with my activities in behalf of the U.S. Government. He further advised me that being in an overt cover status I should state, if asked under oath, that I am currently a CIA employee.

4. On 10 January 1977 I traveled to Miami where I met and conferred with AUSA Karen Atkinson and DEA S/A Robert Fredericks. They informed me that Gerald P. Hemming's case had been severed and his trial would not begin on 11 January. AUSA Atkinson told me she wanted me as a rebuttal witness if Gerald P. Hemming presented the defense that he had been working at the direction of DEA. She said they would not call me until and unless that defense was presented. She also said that she felt that any attempt to question me concerning my current place of employment was irrelevent and she would object to any such line of questioning. She said she would only ask me where I was employed at the time I interviewed Hemming. I returned to Washington D.C. The same day.

(Thomas L. Briggs)

Distribution:

1 - CCS

1 - 0S

1 - OGC

16 January 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

FROM:

Edmund Cohen

Assistant General Counsel

SUBJECT:

U.S. v. Hemming

1. On 22 November 1977 the undersigned accompanied by Messrs. Thomas Briggs Gary Mattocks and Robert Barteaux, travelled to Miami to confer with Judge Hoeveler, and Assistant U.S. Attorney Thomas M. Sherouse, U.S. District Court, Southern District of Florida, about subject case. Messrs. Briggs and Mattocks had dealt with Mr. Hemming while they were employed by the Drug Enforcement Administration and Mr. Sherouse wanted them available as rebuttal witnesses. Mr. Barteaux also was sought as a possible rebuttal witness to describe the Agency's relationship with Mr. Hemming in the event that Hemming raised a CIA defense.

- 2. On 23 November Mr. Briggs Mr. Barteaux and the undersigned met in chambers with Judge Hoeveler, Mr. Sherouse, Mr. Roger Howard, law clerk to Judge Hoeveler, and Mr. Ted Sakowitz, Public Defender for the Southern District of Florida. Mr. Sherouse decided that Mr. Mattocks would not be required to testify and he did not attend the meeting. The Judge initially expressed some reluctance to have an exparte conference because Mr. Hemming had assumed primary responsibility for his own defense with only limited assistance from the Public Defender. The Judge insisted that a transcript of the meeting be made but he promised that the transcript would be sealed and, in fact, would not be transcribed.
- 3. The undersigned indicated that the Agency had no interest in the outcome of the case and interposed no objection to the introduction of any relevant information. Our sole concern was to protect Mr. Briggs and his relationship with CIA both before and after his DEA employment. The Judge was informed that Mr. Briggs sole connection with Hemming was on 23 May 1975 and that he had no contact with Hemming during any period of Agency employment. The national security consequences of exposure of Mr. Briggs as well as the career consequences were outlined. In addition, the Judge was informed that Mr. Barteaux was prepared to testify as an overt Agency employee about any relationship between Hemming and CIA.

SECRET

E. 2. IMPDET CL BY \$35114

- 4. Judge Hoeveler asked Mr. Sakowitz to cross-examine Mr. Briggs to determine whether he had any information which might be relevant to Hemming's defense. Mr. Sakowitz stated that although he was aware that Mr. Hemming wished to call Mr. Briggs as a witness, he was not fully informed of all aspects of the case and, therefore, reluctant to question Mr. Briggs) Thereupon, Judge Hoeveler, swore in Mr. Briggs and proceeded to ask him a series of questions to determine whether Mr. Briggs interaction with Mr. Hemming had been in any way connected with his CIA employment. At the conclusion of this examination the Judge gave Mr. Sakowitz a second opportunity to question Mr. Briggs and when Mr. Sakowitz again declined, he stated that in light of the national security consequences which had been brought to his attention he was not inclined to permit questions relating to Mr. Briggs CIA employment.
- 5. At the conclusion of the conference in chambers, but before the jury was admitted into the courtroom, Mr. Sherouse informed Mr. Hemming that Mr. Briggs) was available as a witness. When the trial proceeded Mr. Hemming concluded his defense without calling Mr. Briggs). Mr. Sherouse, however, did call Mr. of Briggs as a rebuttal witness. On cross-examination Mr. Hemming asked Mr. Briggs whether he was with CIA. Mr. Sherouse promptly objected to the question, the Judge sustained the objection and Mr. Hemming went on to the next question. The trial concluded soon afterwards without Mr. Barteaux being called as a witness. It was subsequently learned that Mr. Hemming was found guilty as charged.

Edmund Cohen

EC: jz

Distribution:

Original / LITIGATION-CRIMINAL, Hemming Gerald P.

1 - EC Signer

1 - Chrono

14-00000

OUTSIDE ACTIVITY APPROVAL REQUEST										
COMPLETE AND FORWARD ORIGINAL AND 2 COPIES TO EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES BRANCH										
TO :	DIRECTOR OF SECURITY; ATTN: EXTERNAL ACTIVITIES BRANCH									
THRU:	(Staff, division or office head and se	curity officer, where assig	ned)							
	Sa Division breasity Offices									
FROM:	NAME AND GRADE OF EMPLOYEE (Print or	COMPONENT	ROOM NO. AND BLDG.	PHONE						
	CHIGGS, Thomas Da 12/3	* * 1	180 52 29	3.53						
I. FULL DESCRIPTION OF OUTSIDE ACTIVITY FOR WHICH APPROVAL IS REQUESTED INCLUDING NAMES OF ORGANIZATIONS OR INDIVIDUALS CONCERNED. DATES. LOCALE. ETC. (Refer to HR 10-7 before completing) OR 7 January 1977 at approx. IN TO before completing) OR 7 January 1977 at approx. IN TO before completing a r. The process of TR in Figure, that she had been to be produced by a r. The process of TR in Figure, to Figure and the first of the first to note to a pre-trial conference on a note 10 decreases in creder to property for possible appearance as a sixteer for the English because the classical break Fatrick IN The Consulted will the distribution because of the class of the contest the Old. At approx. If I have a fix a fix a fix a fix a fix the class of the class of the contest to the Office of because, extended activities and ch. 2. REMARKS BY REQUESTOR IN ENGAGING IN THE REQUESTED ACTIVITY, I WILL MAKE NO REFERENCE TO OR DISCUSS MY CIA ASSIGNMENTS OR DUTIES. I (WILL, WILL NOT) BE IDENTIFIED AS EMPLOYED BY CIA FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:										
un	was a CIA employee from Jon 69 ocr cover at the time. It have Uan 77).	ලක් දෙන්න සමන සිටු ජීවය ම <u>රාම</u> න	runsierring to Mid for cover since m	v new						
3. COMME	CONCUR:	DATE S	IGNATURE OF OPERATING O	OFF ICIAL						
		D, DENIED)								

CLASSIFY AS APPROPRIATE

 $4\mathbb{N}$ (FOR) CHIEF, SECURITY SUPPORT DIVISION

9/7 Mo Sovery - discuss Therese all re Q Doc re DCD andred you drug - Let de Bos Bosteaux to be ready to testify. hip Rosery section. MFR on a Dec Syste uf Tom Sherouse 305 350 5449 Trul 250ct. 1 25 Oct - but call will call to me 21 od to see where y tand 10/25 Spoke W/ Shewer Hemma care is #8 on Judger Calade in a coult 1 earlied is late Next whe ad earlied Henry - will be own lawyer Balan, By, Madox of he rebulled care Hubs Fri lets AM roof to call on 16th to check. 11/15 Meet of Mo 5. Brys Maddox, Barteaux reven Shows statenth, ck or why left apry or why returned, what doing, sales meet of Mar & Bouteman get 100 (Mal) view re import of public exposure on (Arygo) or Modelox or briefor review of Bartenn all recent on Henry. reserve for In EA 195 Not 19and 900 - 3 amou 1/20 11/17 - Called M - for more

SIPI

Rockville Md 20850 Jan 69 - May 74 C/A - Arry & Ar aming - Army oranger ops" clentito b. My 74 - 1 Jan 77 DEA CS. S. Jan 77 - No one State over 2 only entrol of Herms -23 May 75 3, Deny to DC - & see Comen your Y NOW Sor tayet resemble to name from 50 - regional - law empressed of cit cond - we ented remember

3/2/

	?.0. B つ	1dg > 21 e 32an	ct House	. 300 ooy 35	NE. Frot Ave Miami Florida 0-4136							
	Thoma	s M.	Sher	ouse	t24_	20	ntta	ney (3	ريه	350 5	149 ~	447)
	Sec	Mary =	Tores	300	Ainsl	ey Bld	g -	ney (3	<u>hm</u>	856	2275	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						· ·	<u> </u>	· · · · · ·			
		•	- · ·	. 11 - 10 - 14	and the second							
		•							· .			
				·	· ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•			
			,									
	,		Andreas and the second of the	_						•		<u></u>
			*									• •
						i	· · ,					
								-				
····	,		* • .			•			. "			
·		•			·						•	
	<u></u>		· to		1					-		
·	• • •	<u></u>				· .	•					
	<u> </u>							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			<u> </u>	
ana arragamente din									•		•	<u>.</u>
	7	<u>.</u>										
	;;··	` ` ` .	i e	· ·			<u> </u>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
				•		1					:	

1879

Say Maddox - 4378958

Pany Maddox - 4378958

Pany Cra - 69-73 - any come Volume

- DEA Aug 73 - 26 Ed 77 (comm come) CIA 27. Feb 77 - gen 5-6 why Han State over now luhan pro- carter pople durantem 2. The later than Dec 76 could of Maddax no color before DEA

rever personal color of Moud DEA cold 3. red uf Henry met met men e purhere 1) navetres

2 m Miane and, hour augus re Smen

2 miting sold gust s) prendre Commencelyse 4 nn - - Caba gri -

m re Mrs v KDI ogske p syl -No predes and for Rends de ut it of he one my to shim Henry has Phlady claimed asses 3. In Och 60 3 amy m amy 1161, 1 m 1967, 3 m 1970 after 23 Ag 70 ozum Henry Can who sperly need in W

